



Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/622,642

Applicant(s)

HIRATA ET AL.

Examiner

Jordan M. Schwartz

Art Unit

2873

All Participants:

(1) Jordan M. Schwartz.

(2) Gary Edwards.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 1 June 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

65, 69

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In the prior office action, the examiner had suggested language to place the application in condition for allowance. However, the examiner inadvertently failed to notice that the claim did not include the "absolute value" language which was the assumed meaning of the examiner for purposes of examination and without which, the specification lacks enablement. The examiner called applicant's representative, Gary Edwards, and stated that the specification and Figures (such as Figure 7 and the specification pages 46-47) supported the "absolute value" of the second derivative values increasing and decreasing as claimed and that this was the examiner's assumed meaning. It was therefore agreed to make the changes to the claims, as set forth in the attached examiner's amendment, to overcome a potential 112 lack of enablement rejection and place the application in condition for allowance.